REMARKS

Claims 1-33 have been rejected. In the present response, claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 26-29 and 33 have been amended and new claims 34 and 35 have been added.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action - Rejection Under 37 CFR 1.75(c),

Claim 33 has been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Claim 33 has been amended to change the term "production" at line 1 of claim 33 to changed to "product" and is now believed to be in correct form. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action - Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-25, 27 and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uchiyama (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065802). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Examiner, all of the limitations of claims 1-25, 27 and 29-31 are taught by seven paragraphs of Uchiyama. In particular, the Examiner states that paragraph 0058 of Uchiyama teaches "obtaining a set of one or more rules for collecting information by a first application residing on a client (i.e., the user entering data into the terminal directly..." Based on this statement, the Examiner erroneously associates the inputting of information by a user as described in paragraph 0058 of Uchiyama as the act of obtaining a set of rules that are to be followed for collecting information from a second application (e.g., a browser) in a manner recited in the claims at issue. Paragraph 0058 of Uchiyama simply does not teach, suggest or disclose the act of "obtaining of a set of rules for collecting information" as recited by the claims at issue.

To further clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to further recite that "the set of rules is obtained in response to a request that includes an identifier associated with the client and information related to rules presently stored at the client[.]" Nowhere in Uchiyama is it taught, disclosed or suggested that a set of rules be obtained in response to a request and that this request include an identifier associated with the client and information related to rules presently stored at

the client. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is believed to be patentably distinguishable from the disclosure set forth in Uchiyama. Claims 9, 17 and 25 have been amended in a similar fashion to claim 1 and, at least for the same reasons, are each believed to be allowable over Uchiyama. Claims 27 and 29 have also been amended to recite similar limitations as that recited in amended claim 1, and thus are also believed to be patentably distinguishable over Uchiyama for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Claims 2-8, and 30-31, 33 depend from amended claim 1 and, by virtue of their dependencies, are believed to be in condition for allowance at least for the same reasons as amended claim 1. Claims 10-16 depend from amended claim 9 and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their respective dependencies to amended claim 9. Claims 18-24 depend from amended claim 17 and, therefore, are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 17.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action - Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 26 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama in view of Moshfeghi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,166). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 26 has been amended to recite a limitation similar to that presented in amended claim 1, namely: "wherein the set of rules is obtained in response to a request that includes an identifier associated with the client and information related to rules presently stored at the client[.]" As discussed above, Uchiyama does not teach, disclose or suggest this limitation as manner in amended claim 26. Although the Examiner does not rely Moshfeghi for this purpose, Moshfeghi also fails to teach, disclose or suggest this limitation as recited in amended claim 26. As a result, claim 26, as amended is believed to be patentably distinction from Uchiyama and Moshfeghi both separately or in combination with one another.

Claim 32 depends from amended claim 1 and, since neither Uchiyama nor Moshfeghi teach, disclose or suggest the limitations recited in amended claim 1, claim 32 is believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of its dependency from amended claim 1.

The Examiner further asserts that Moshfeghi teaches the use of priorities for content presentation and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the teachings of Moshfeghi into the system described in Uchiyama "for the purpose of allowing for a more personal internet experience by not only tailoring the information received, based on the behaviors of the user, but by also adding the ability of the user to determine the relevance of his/her behaviors and how they affect the present of content..." This argument is also respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully asserted that the Examiner's statement that Moshfeghi "teaches the use of priority for personalizing content presentation based on the desires of users using a hospital intranet" is based on an erroneous interpretation of the Abstract, Fig. 1 and claim 22 of Moshfeghi. Claim 22 of Moshfeghi states "...dynamically generating prioritized retrieval rules in response to each individual user request..." (see Moshfeghi 10:28-29). Interpreting this limitation in view of supporting in Fig. 2 and 6:48-7:30 of Moshfeghi, it is clear that Moshfeghi describes a process for prioritizing the selection of retrieval rules inclusion in a rules set and not a process for prioritizing content. In contrast, claim 26 as amended recites limitations directed to prioritizing the order in which the content is to be presented to the user. Based on this distinction, it is respectfully asserted that amended claim 26 is further distinguishable from Moshfeghi.

Claim 32 recites that "time information is utilized to determine an order of priority by which the content is selected." As discussed above, Moshfeghi deals with the prioritizing of the selection of retrieval rules not the prioritizing of content based on time information. Therefore, claim 32 is believed to be patentably distinguishable from Moshfeghi for this reason in addition to its dependence from amended claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 26 and 32 is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action - Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 28 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama in view of Masters, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,697).

Claims 28 has been amended to further recite that "the set of rules is obtained in response to a request that includes an identifier associated with the client and information related to rules presently stored at the client[.]" As previously set forth in the section regarding Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, neither Uchiyama nor Masters teach, disclose or suggest this limitation in the manner set forth under amended claim 28. Therefore, amended claim 28 is believed to be patentably distinguishable over both Uchiyama and Masters.

In addition, claim 28 has been amended in a manner that further distinguishes it from Masters. Specifically, claim 28 has been amended to recite that the "table is accessed to determine whether the content is locally available to the client" to further clarify the difference between it and the routing table described in Masters. The routing table as described in Masters is directed to providing information about paths through a network and does not teach, disclose or suggest anything a function for helping to determine whether the content is locally available to the client as recited in claim 28. Accordingly, amended claim 28 is believed to be patentable over Uchiyama in view of Masters for this reason as well. Claim 33 depends from amended claim 28 and at least by virtue of its dependency is believed to be patentable over Uychiyama in view of Masters.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for claims 28 and 33 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3215.

In addition, if for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. **05-0150**.

Date: December 16, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Vidya R. Bhakar
Registration No. 42,323

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

PaloAlto/74215.1